arXiv:quant-ph/0112159v2 6 Aug 2002

# A Non-commutative Version of the Fundamental Theorem of Asset Pricing*

Zeqian Chen

Wuhan Institute of Physics and Mathematics, Chinese Academy of Sciences

30 West District, Xiao-Hong Mountain, Wuhan

P.O.Box 71010, Wuhan 430071

E-mail: zqchen@wipm.ac.cn

*Abstract*. In this note, a non-commutative analogue of the fundamental theorem of asset pricing in mathematical finance is proved.

## 1. Introduction

In retrospect, the field of mathematical finance has undergone a remarkable development since the seminal papers by F.Black and M.Scholes [2] and R.Merton [15], in which the famous "Black-Scholes Option Pricing Formula" was derived. The idea of developing a "formula" for the price of an option actually goes back as far as 1900, when L.Bachelier wrote a thesis with the title "Théorie de la spéculation" [1]. It was Bachelier who firstly had the innovative idea of using a *stochastic process* as a model for the price evolution of a stock. For a stochastic process $(S_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$ he made a natural and far-reaching choice being the first to give a mathematical definition of Brownian motion, which in the present context is interpreted as follows: $S_0$ is today's (known) price of a stock (say a share of company XYZ to fix ideas) while for the time $t > 0$ the price $S_t$ is a normally distributed random variable.

The basic problem of Bachelier, as well as of modern Mathematical Finance in general, is that of assigning a price to a contingent claim. Bachelier used the equilibrium argument. It was the merit of Black and Scholes [2] and Merton [15] to have replaced this argument by a so-called "no-arbitrage" argument, which is of central importance to the entire theory. Roughly speaking, an arbitrage is a riskless way of making a profit with zero net investment. An economically very reasonable assumption on a financial market consists of requiring that there are no arbitrage opportunities. The remarkable fact is that this simple and primitive

*2000 Mathematics Subject Classification: 46L53, 91B28

*Key words and phrases*: von Neumann algebras, non-commutative martingales, asset pricing, no free lunch.

"principle of no arbitrage" allows already to determine a unique option price in the Black-Scholes model. This is the theme of the so-called *fundamental theorem of asset pricing* which states briefly that a process $S = (S_t)$ does not allow arbitrage opportunities if and only if there is an equivalent probability measure under which $S$ is a martingale.

The history of the fundamental asset pricing theorem goes back to the seminal work of Harrison, Kreps and Pliska ([11, 12, 14]). After their pioneering work many authors made contributions to gradually improve the understanding about this fundamental theorem, e.g., Duffie and Huang [10], Stricker [21], Dalang, Morton, and Willinger [6], and Delbaen and Schachermayer [7] etc. In [8] this theorem was proved to hold true for very general (commutative) stochastic processes.

In this note we deal with this issue in the non-commutative (= quantum) setting. After having formalized the notations of (quantum) arbitrage and quantum trading strategies, we shall prove a non-commutative analogue of the fundamental theorem of asset pricing. As shown in [4], there are several reasons why quantizing mathematical finance may be interesting. In particular, classical mathematical finance theory is a well established discipline of applied mathematics (see [9, 20] and references therein) which has found numerous applications in financial markets (see for example [13, 16]). Since it is based on probability to a large extend, there is a fundamental interest in generalizing this theory to the domain of quantum probabilities. Indeed, recently non-commutative (= quantum) probability theory has developed considerably. In particular, all sorts of non-commutative analogues of Brownian motion and martingales have been studied. We refer to [17] and references therein. Moreover, it has recently been shown that the quantum version of financial markets is maybe much more suited to real-world financial markets rather than the classical one, because the quantum binomial model ceases to pose the paradox which appears in the classical model of the binomial market, see [3, 5] for details.

# 2. Notational preliminaries and the main result

Throughout this note we shall denote by $(\mathcal{A}, \tau)$ a $W^*$-non-commutative probability space, namely, $\mathcal{A}$ is a finite von Neumann algebra, and $\tau$ is a faithful normal tracial state on $\mathcal{A}$. (See [18, 23] for details on von Neumann algebras.) We shall denote by $L^p(\mathcal{A}, \tau)$ or simply $L^p(\mathcal{A})$ the non-commutative $L^p$-spaces. Note that if $p = \infty, L^p(\mathcal{A})$ is just $\mathcal{A}$ itself with the algebra norm; also recall that the norm in $L^p(\mathcal{A})$ $(1 \leq p < \infty)$ is defined as

$$\|a\|_p = \tau[|a|^p]^{\frac{1}{p}},$$

where $|a| = (a^* a)^{1/2}$ is the usual absolute value of $a$. We shall assume that $\mathcal{A}$ is filtered, so that there exists a family $(\mathcal{A}_t)_{t \in \mathbf{R}_+}$ of unital weakly closed $*$- subalgebras of $\mathcal{A}$, such that $\mathcal{A}_s \subset \mathcal{A}_t$ for all $s, t$ with $s \leq t$, and $\mathcal{A}_0 = \mathbf{C} I$, $I$ denoting the unit element in $\mathcal{A}$. Since the state $\tau$ is tracial, for any unital weakly closed $*$-subalgebra $\mathcal{B}$ of $\mathcal{A}$, there exists a unique conditional expectation onto $\mathcal{B}$. We shall denote by $E_\tau[.|\mathcal{B}]$ this conditional expectation. Recall that it

extends to a contraction on all $L^p$-spaces for $1 \leq p \leq \infty$. A map $t \to M_t$ from $[0, +\infty)$ to $L^p(\mathcal{A}, \tau)$ will be called a martingale with respect to the filtration $(\mathcal{A}_t)_{t \in \mathbf{R}_+}$ if for every $s \leq t$ one has that $E_\tau[M_t | \mathcal{A}_s] = M_s$.

However, even for a state $\sigma$ in a finite dimensional von Neumann algebra $\mathcal{A}$ the conditional expectation operator $E_\sigma[.|\mathcal{B}]$ of a $*$-subalgebra $\mathcal{B}$ of $\mathcal{A}$ does not need to exist in general (for details see [22]). Thus we cannot define a martingale under $\sigma$ as in the case of the tracial states or the commutative setting. It seems to us that one needs to generalize the definition of martingales in the non-commutative setting as following:

*Definition 1.* Given any fixed state $\sigma$ on $\mathcal{A}$. A family $\{M_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ in $\mathcal{A}$ is said to be a $(non - commutative)$ martingale with respect to $(\mathcal{A}, (\mathcal{A}_t)_{t \geq 0}, \sigma)$ if it is adapted to $(\mathcal{A}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ and for every $0 \leq s \leq t$,

$$\sigma(a M_t a^*) = \sigma(a M_s a^*),$$

for all $a \in \mathcal{A}_s$.

Clearly, when $\sigma$ is a normal tracial state the above definition coincides to the usual definition of the non-commutative martingales. In the sequel we understand the non-commutative martingales in this sense. We would like to point out that those martingales in the above sense are suitable in the so-called quantum finance, for details see [4].

Together with $(\mathcal{A}, \tau)$ we shall also consider the opposite algebra $\mathcal{A}^{op}$, with the trace $\tau^{op}$, namely $\tau = \tau^{op}$ as a linear map on $\mathcal{A}$, but the notation is meant to stress the algebra structure we are using. The spaces $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{A}$ have natural $\mathcal{A} - \mathcal{A}$ bimodule structures given by multiplication on the right and on the left, namely $a.u.b = aub$ and $a.(u \otimes v).b = au \otimes vb$, or equivalently they have a left $\mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{A}^{op}$-module structure. We shall denote by $\sharp$ these actions, namely one has $(a \otimes b) \sharp u = aub$ and $(a \otimes b) \sharp (u \otimes v) = (au) \otimes (vb)$. The map $\tau \otimes \tau^{op}$ defines a tracial state on the $*$-algebra $\mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{A}^{op}$, and we shall denote by $L^p(\tau \otimes \tau^{op})$ the corresponding $L^p$- spaces, thus $L^\infty(\tau \otimes \tau^{op})$ is the von Neumann algebra tensor product of $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{A}^{op}$.

A simple biprocess is a piecewise constant map $t \to H_t$ from $\mathbf{R}_+$ into the algebraic tensor product $\mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{A}^{op}$, such that $H_t = 0$ for $t$ large enough. It is called to be adapted if one has $H_t \in \mathcal{A}_t \otimes \mathcal{A}_t$ for all $t \geq 0$. In this case, it is clear that one can choose a decomposition

$$H_t = \sum_{j=1}^{n} A_{j,t} \otimes B_{j,t} \tag{1}$$

such that there exist times $0 = t_0 \leq t_1 \leq ... \leq t_m$ with $A_{j,t} = A_{j,t_k},\ B_{j,t} = B_{j,t_k} \in \mathcal{A}_{t_k}$ for $t \in [t_k, t_{k+1}), A_{j,t} = B_{j,t} = 0$ for all $t \geq t_m$ (in the sequel we shall always assume that the decompositions we choose satisfy such properties).

In the sequel we always assume that $X = (X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is a self-adjoint stochastic process adapted to the filtered space $(\mathcal{A}, (\mathcal{A})_{t \geq 0})$, i.e., for every $t \geq 0, X_t \in \mathcal{A}_t$ and $X_t^* = X_t$.

*Definition 2.* Let $H$ be a simple adapted biprocess with a decomposition as above, then

the stochastic integral of $H$ with respect to $X = (X_t)_{t\geq 0}$ is

$$\int_0^\infty H_s \sharp dX_s = \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} H_{t_k} \sharp (X_{t_{k+1}} - X_{t_k}) = \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} \sum_{j=1}^{n_k} A_{j,t_k} (X_{t_{k+1}} - X_{t_k}) B_{j,t_k}. \tag{2}$$

This is clearly independent of the decomposition chosen.

For a simple adapted biprocess $H$, and $s < t$, we shall denote $H^{(s,t)}$ the stopped simple adapted biprocess given by $H_r^{(s,t)} = H_r$ for $s \leq r < t$ and $H_r^{(s,t)} = 0$ for $r < s$ or $r \geq t$. Then we define

$$\int_s^t H_r \sharp dX_r = \int_0^\infty H_r^{(s,t)} \sharp dX_r.$$

We shall write $(H\sharp X)_t = \int_0^t H_r \sharp dX_r$.

*Remark 1.* The space of adapted simple biprocesses has an antilinear involution, coming from the antilinear involution on $\mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{A}$

$$(\sum A_j \otimes B_j)^* = \sum B_j^* \otimes A_j^*.$$

The adjoint of the stochastic integral is again a stochastic integral, namely with the adjoint of a biprocess as above, one has that

$$(\int_0^\infty H_t \sharp dX_t)^* = \int_0^\infty H_t^* \sharp dX_t.$$

*Definition 3.* $\mathcal{H}$ denotes the set of simple *quantum trading strategies* for $X = (X_t)_{t\geq 0}$. An element $H = (H_t)_{t\geq 0} \in \mathcal{H}$ is a simple biprocess of the form

$$H_t = \sum \alpha_j a_j \otimes a_j^*,$$

with $a_j \in \mathcal{A}_t$, where $\alpha_j$ are all real numbers.

*Remark 2.* Evidently, $\int_0^\infty H_t \sharp dX_t$ is self-adjoint provided $H \in \mathcal{H}$.

We define $K^s$ the set of all self-adjoint elements of form $(H \circ X)_\infty$, where $H \in \mathcal{H}$, and $C^s$ the convex cone of self-adjoint elements $a$ in $\mathcal{A}$ with the property that $a \leq b$ for some $b \in K^s$. We denote by $\bar{C}^*$ the closure of $C^s$ with respect to the weak-star topology $\sigma(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{A}_*)$ of $\mathcal{A}$, where $\mathcal{A}_*$ is the predual space of $\mathcal{A}$. It is well known that

$$\mathcal{A}_* = L^1(\mathcal{A}, \tau)$$

via the correspondence that

$$b \longrightarrow \tau[ab], \quad b \in L^1(\mathcal{A}, \tau),$$

for each $a \in \mathcal{A}$.

*Definition 4* (e.g., [14]). We say that $X = (X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ satisfies the condition of no free lunch (NFL) if

$$\bar{C}^* \cap \mathcal{A}_+ = \{0\}. \tag{3}$$

*Definition 5.* A normal state $\sigma$ on $\mathcal{A}$ is called a martingale state of $X = (X_t)_{t \geq 0}$, if $X = (X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is a martingale on $(\mathcal{A}, (\mathcal{A})_{t \geq 0}, \sigma)$.

We denote by $M_f(X)$ the family of all such faithful normal states, and say that $X = (X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ satisfies the condition of the existence of a faithful martingale state (EMS) if $M_f(X) \neq \emptyset$.

As following is a non-commutative analogue of the fundamental theorem of asset pricing in mathematical finance:

**Theorem**. *A non-commutative self-adjoint stochastic process $X = (X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ satisfies the condition of no free lunch (NFL) if and only if the condition (EMS) of the existence of a faithful martingale state is satisfied.*

*Remark 3.* In [4] the author has proved a special case of the above theorem on finite dimensional von Neumann algebras, whose proof is different from that presented here. By using this theorem we present a quantum version of the classical asset pricing theory of multi-period financial markets based on finite dimensional quantum probability spaces.

# 3. Proofs

**Lemma 1**. *Let $H$ be in $\mathcal{H}$ and let $\sigma$ be a state on $\mathcal{A}$. If $X = (X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is a martingale under $\sigma$, then $t \longrightarrow (H \sharp X)_t$ is also a martingale under $\sigma$.*

*Proof.* Let $H_t = a \otimes a^* 1_{[t_1, t_2)}(t)$ where $a \in \mathcal{A}_{t_1}$. Let $s \leq t$ and $y \in \mathcal{A}_s$. We have to prove that

$$\sigma[y \int_s^t H_r \sharp dX_r y^*] = 0.$$

One has that

$$\int_s^t H_r \sharp dX_r = a(X_{\min(\max(t,t_1),t_2)} - X_{\max(\min(s,t_2),t_1)})a^*.$$

Since $X = (X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is a martingale, we get the result. The general case follows since linear combinations of martingales are martingales.

**Lemma 2**. *Let $\sigma$ be a state on $\mathcal{A}$. Then, $X = (X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is a martingale under $\sigma$ if and only if*

$$\sigma[(H \sharp X)_\infty] = 0,$$

*for every $H \in \mathcal{H}$.*

*Proof.* Suppose that $X = (X_t)_{t\geq 0}$ is a martingale. By Lemma 1 one concludes that

$$\sigma[(H\sharp X)_\infty] = \sigma[(H\sharp X)_0] = 0,$$

for every $H \in \mathcal{H}$.

Conversely, let $s \leq t$ and $y \in \mathcal{A}_s$. Set $H_r = y \otimes y^* 1_{[s,t)}(r)$. Then

$$(H\sharp X)_\infty = y(X_t - X_s)y^*,$$

and hence $\sigma[y(X_t - X_s)y^*] = 0$. The proof is complete.

*Proof of the Theorem.* (EMS) $\Longrightarrow$ (NFL): By Lemma 2 we have that $\sigma(c) \leq 0$ for each $\sigma \in M_f(X)$ and $c \in C^s$, and this inequality also extends to the weak-star closure $\bar{C}^*$. However, if (EMS) would hold and (NFL) were violated, there would exist a $\sigma \in M_f(X)$ and $c \in \bar{C}^*, c > 0$, whence $\sigma(c) > 0$ since $\sigma$ is faithful, a contradiction.

(NFL) $\Longrightarrow$ (EMS): We claim that, for fixed $a_0 \in \mathcal{A}, a_0 > 0$, there is $b \in L^1(\mathcal{A})$ which defines a positive linear functional $\tau_b$ on $\mathcal{A}$ via

$$\tau_b(a) = \tau[ab], \quad a \in \mathcal{A},$$

such that $\tau_b$ is less or equal to zero on $\bar{C}^*$, and $\tau_b(a_0) > 0$. To see this, apply the separation theorem (e.g., [19, Theorem II.9.2]) to the $\sigma(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{A}_*)$-closed convex set $\bar{C}^*$ and the compact set $\{a_0\}$ to find a $b \in L^1(\mathcal{A})$ and $\alpha < \beta$ such that $\tau_b[c] \leq \alpha$ for all $c \in \bar{C}^*$ and $\tau_b(a_0) > \beta$. Since $0 \in C^s$ we concludes that $\alpha \geq 0$. As $\bar{C}^*$ is a cone, we have that $\tau_b$ is zero or negative on $\bar{C}^*$ and, in particular, nonnegative on $\mathcal{A}_+$. Noting that $\beta > 0$ we have proved the claim.

Denote by $\mathcal{B}$ the set of all $b \in L^1(\mathcal{A})$ so that $\tau_b$ is a positive linear functional on $\mathcal{A}$ which is less or equal to zero on $\bar{C}^*$. Clearly $0 \in \mathcal{B}$ and hence $\mathcal{B}$ is nonempty.

Let $\mathcal{S}$ be the set of all supports $s(\tau_b)$ of $\tau_b, b \in \mathcal{B}$. Note that $\mathcal{S}$ is a $\sigma$-lattice in the usual order, as for a sequence $b_n \in \mathcal{B}$, we may find strictly positive scalars $\alpha_n$ such that $\sum_n \alpha_n b_n \in \mathcal{B}$. Hence there is $b_0 \in \mathcal{B}$ such that

$$s(\tau_{b_0}) = \sup\{s(\tau_b) : \ b \in \mathcal{B}\}.$$

We now claim that $s(\tau_{b_0}) = 1$, which readily shows that $\tau_{b_0}$ is faithful. Indeed, if $s(\tau_{b_0}) < 1$, then we could apply the above claim to $1 - s(\tau_{b_0})$ to find $b_1 \in \mathcal{B}$ with

$$\tau[b_1(1 - s(\tau_{b_0}))] > 0.$$

Hence, $b_0 + b_1$ would be an element of $\mathcal{B}$ whose support is bigger than $s(\tau_{b_0})$, a contradiction.

Normalize $\tau_{b_0}$ so that $\tau_{b_0}[1] = 1$, we concludes from Lemma 2 that $\sigma = \tau_{b_0}$ is a martingale state for $X$ and thus, $M_f(X) \neq \emptyset$. The proof is complete.

*Remark 4.* The exhaustion argument in the above proof goes back to Yan [24].

## Acknowledgment

This paper was partly written when the author visited Equipe de Mathématiques, Université de Franche-Comté, supported by the grant of the academic cooperation agreement between CAS and CNRS. He would like to thank the Equipe de Mathématiques for its kind hospitality. In particular, he is very grateful to Professor Q.Xu for conversations on non-commutative probability.

REFERENCES

**1** L.Bachelier, Théorie de la spéculation, *Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup.*, 17, 21-86 (1900). English translation in: *The Random Character of Stock Market Prices,* P.Cootner ed., MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass., 1964, pp 17-78

**2** F.Black, M.Scholes, The pricing of options and corporate liabilities, *J. Political Econ.,* 81, 637-659 (1973)

**3** Zeqian Chen, The meaning of quantum finance, submitted to *Acta Math.Sci.*(Chinese Edition)

**4** Zeqian Chen, Quantum Finance: The Finite Dimensional Cases, (quant-ph/0112158v2), 2001

**5** Zeqian Chen, Quantum theory for the binomial model in finance theory, (quant-ph/0112156v5)

**6** R.C.Dalang, A.Morton, W.Willinger, Equivalent martingale measures and no-arbitrage in stochastic securities market model, *Stochastics Stoch. Rep.,* 29, 185-201 (1990)

**7** F.Delbaen, W.Schachermayer, A general version of the fundamental theorem of asset pricing, *Math. Ann.,* 300(1994), 463-520

**8** F.Delbaen, W.Schachermayer, The fundamental theorem of asset pricing for unbounded stochastic processes, *Math. Ann.,* 312(1998), 215-250

**9** F.Delbaen, W.Schachermayer, Applications to mathematical finance, In: *Handbook of the Geometry of Banach Spaces,* W.B.Johnson and J.Lindenstrauss, eds, Elsevier Science B.V., Amsterdam, 2001, 367-391

**10** D.Duffie, C.F.Huang, Multiperiod security markets with differential information: martingales and resolution times, *J. Math. Econom.,* 15, 283-303 (1986)

**11** J.M.Harrison, D.M.Kreps, Martingales and arbitrage in multiperiod securities markets, *J. Econ. Theory,* 20(1979), 381-408

**12** J.M.Harrison, S.R.Pliska, Martingales and stochastic interfrals in the theory of continuous trading, *Stoch. Proc. Appl.,* 11(1981), 215-260

**13** J.C.Hull, *Options, Futures and Other Derivatives,* 4th Edition, Prentice-Hall, Inc., Prentice Hall, 2000

**14** D.M.Kreps, Arbitrage and equilibrium in economies with infinitely many commodities, *J. Math. Econ.,* 8(1981), 15-35

**15** R.C.Merton, Theory of rational option pricing, *Bell J. Econ. Manag. Sci.,* 4, 141-183 (1973)

**16** R.C.Merton, *Continuous-time Finance,* Black-Well, Basil, 1990

**17** G.Pisier, Q.Xu, Non-commutative martingale inequalities, *Comm. Math. Physics,* 189, 667-698 (1997)

**18** S.Sakai, *$C^*$-Algebras and $W^*$-Algebras,* Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1971

**19** H.H.Schäfer, *Topological Vector Spaces,* Springer- Verlag, Berlin, 1966

**20** A.N.Shiryaev, *Essentials of Stochastic Finance* $(Facts, Models, Theory)$, World Scientific, Singapore, 1999

**21** C.Stricker, Arbitrage et lois de martingale, *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré, Probab. Statist.,* 26(1990), 451-460

**22** M.Takesaki, Conditional expectations in von Neumann algebras, *J. Funct. Anal.,* 9(1972), 306-321

**23** M.Takesaki, *Theory of Operator Algebras I,* Springer, New York, 2001

**24** Jia'an Yan, Caracterisation d'une classe d'ensembles convexes de $L^1$ ou $H^1$, *Lecture Notes in Math.,* vol.784, Springer-Verlag, 1980, 220-222